ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Tom Croat and Dr. Robin Foster for providing the material from Barro Colorado Island, the Missouri Botanical Garden (MO) and the Instituto Botanico in Caracas (VEN) for loan of specimens, and Ms. Mary Breckon for making the drawings.

LITERATURE CITED

- Airy Shaw, H. K. 1966. A dictionary of the flowering plants and ferns, by J. C. Willis. 7th ed. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- JABLONSKY, E. 1967. Botany of the Guayana highland—part VII: Euphorbiaceae. Mem. N.Y. Bot. Gard. 17:80-190.
- Monachino, J. V. 1948. Three new species of Drypetes. Phytologia 3:32-35.
- Pax, F., and K. Hoffmann. 1922. Euphorbiaceae—Phyllanthoideae—Phyllantheae—Drypetinae. Das Pflanzenr. 147. XV. (Heft 81):227-280.
- Webster, G. L. 1967. The genera of Euphorbiaceae in the southeastern United States. J. Arnold Arb. 48:303-430.
- ----. 1975. Conspectus of a new classification of the Euphorbiaceae. Taxon 24:593-601.

DARMERA, THE CORRECT NAME FOR PELTIPHYLLUM (SAXIFRAGACEAE), AND A NEW COMBINATION IN PELTOPHYLLUM (TRIURIDACEAE)

RUDOLF SCHMID and MELVIN D. TURNER¹

Department of Botany, University of California, Berkeley 94720

Current work by the senior author on vegetative and floral anatomy of Burmanniaceae, Petrosaviaceae, and Triuridaceae, which are obscure, mainly tropical families of achlorophyllous, saprophytic monocotyledons, has led to two realizations: (1) the long discarded triuridaceous name *Peltophyllum* Gardner (1843) must be used in preference to *Hexuris* Miers (1850), and (2) of particular relevance to horticulturists and to western North American botanists, the well-known saxifragaceous genus *Peltiphyllum* (Engler) Engler (1891) requires a substitute name.

In 1841 John Miers (see also his 1845 paper) described *Triuris* with a single species, *T. hyalina*. Later, George Gardner (1843, 1845) published a new genus and species, *Peltophyllum luteum*. Gardner's original description follows (1843: 176: 1845):

PELTOPHYLLUM, Gardner.

Flores dioici. Masc. ignoti. $F\alpha m$. Perigonium 6-partitum, coloratum, patens, persistens; laciniis ovatis, longè acuminatis; acumine plano. Ovaria plurima, in tori apice sessilia, adpressa, libera. Styli ad apicem incrassati, obliquè truncati. Fructus ignotus.

¹ Present address of MDT: Department of Botany, Duke University, Durham NC 27706.

Herba parvula Brasiliensis. Folia a scapo distantia, longè petiolata, peltata, valdè reticulata. Radix tuberosa, fibrosa. Scapus subramosus, basi squamosus; pedunculis basi bracteatis, unifloris; floribus luteis.

Peltophyllum luteum, Gardn. Herb. Bras. n. 3570.

Peltophyllum luteum was based on a single collection (Gardner 3570), which we have not seen, and which apparently has been lost (Giesen, 1938; Malme, 1896). The Fielding-Druce Herbarium at Oxford University, which has a "very full set" (Clokie, 1964: 169) of Gardner's specimens, informed us (pers. comm., 1976) that it does not have Gardner 3570.

Peltophyllum differed from Triuris in having 6 instead of 3 caudate tepal lobes and also in having remarkable peltate leaves associated with the flowering scapes. Miers (1850, 1852) pointed out that the peltate leaves do not belong to the triuridaceous plant, but probably are of seedlings of Menispermaceae. Rejecting Peltophyllum, Miers (1850, 1852) created the new name Hexuris gardneri for Gardner's fertile material, and since then, Peltophyllum Gardner seems not to have been accepted other than by Schumann (1894) (for later references see Giesen, 1938, the most recent monograph on the family).

The name Hexuris Miers (1850) is clearly illegitimate. Miers substituted this name for Peltophyllum Gardner (1843) because "peltophyllum" is scarcely applicable to the exclusively squamate Triuridaceae. However, according to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (Art. 62), a legitimate name cannot be rejected merely because it is inappropriate or disagreeable. Therefore, the name Peltophyllum, however descriptively inappropriate, must be retained since it is clearly possible from Gardner's description (1843, 1845) to select the fertile material as the type (which is here designated the lectotype of Peltophyllum luteum Gardner). It should be emphasized that apart from the accounts of the peltate leaves and attached tuberous roots, which apparently belong to Menispermaceae (Miers, 1850, 1852), Gardner (1843, 1845) adequately described the new triuridaceous plant, although fruits and male flowers were not discovered until much later by Malme (1896). Gardner in 1845 also accurately figured a female plant complete with its roots and scale leaves.

The consequence of the above is that the well-known name *Hexuris* Miers must be replaced with the more obscure *Peltophyllum* Gardner. Schumann (1894) and the staff workers of *Index Nominum Genericorum* had come to the same conclusion. Following Giesen's (1938) circumscription of *Hexuris* Miers, *Peltophyllum* then includes 2 species: *P. luteum* Gardner (1843) and *P. caudatum* (Poulsen) Schmid & Turner.

The consequence to western North American botanists of the imbroglio over Triuridaceae comes with the recognition that the saxifragaceous

name *Peltiphyllum* (Engler) Engler (1891)² is illegitimate because it is a mere orthographic variant (Art. 75) of the earlier, legitimate *Peltophyllum* Gardner (1843, Triuridaceae) and thus is a later homonym (Art. 64). Therefore, a different generic name must be used for the single species of *Peltiphyllum* (Engler) Engler, the familiar "umbrella plant" (or "Indian rhubarb") of California and southern Oregon, *P. peltatum* (Torrey in Bentham) Engler, a name that has been used in all manuals of our region since the Englerian genus was established (see also Engler, 1930, and Wagner, 1907).

In 1899 the horticulturist Andreas Voss [1857–1924—see obituary in Gartenwelt 28:238–240 (1924)] published the name Darmera³ with Peltiphyllum (Engler) Engler (1891) [the latter name corrected to Peltophyllum Engler in Post and Kuntze (1903)] in synonymy. The reason for Voss's (1899) erection of Darmera was his recognition of the prior publication of the form genus Peltophyllum Massalongo (1854, 1859a), which was applied to a fossil leaf and fruit attributed to Nymphaeaceae (see Summary). Peltophyllum Massalongo, however, is also an illegitimate later homonym of Peltophyllum Gardner, a fact that Voss (1899) overlooked.

Darmera Voss (1899), not Peltiphyllum (Engler) Engler (1891),⁴ therefore is the correct name for the saxifrage. Voss clearly made the combination Darmera peltata (Torrey in Bentham) Voss in 1899 in a highly obscure horticultural journal, Gärtnerisches Zentral-Blatt (full citation in Just's botanischer Jahresbericht 27 (Abt. 2):194 (1899), which ceased publication after only a single volume, issued in 1899.

 $^{^2}$ The genus Peltiphyllum is based on Saxifraga Linnaeus section Peltiphyllum Engler (1872), with the single species $Saxifraga\ peltata$ Torrey in Bentham.

³ Darmera commemorates Karl Darmer of Berlin, the founder and first president of the Allgemeinen Deutschen Gärtner-Verein, and an indefatigable promoter of horticulture in Germany (Voss, 1899).

⁴ Because it lacks a Latin description, Peltiphyllaceae Krach (1976: 23) is not validly published (Art. 36); however, were this name validly published, it would be illegitimate since Peltiphyllum (Engler) Engler is illegitimate (Art. 18). The proper designation for a familial segregation of Darmera Voss (syn.: Peltiphyllum) from Saxifragaceae would, of course, be one based on the generic name Darmera. Although this might be supported by the growing body of organographic, cytological, chemical, anatomical, and especially embryological evidence (Krach, 1976; also Bensel and Palser, 1975a, b; Saxena, 1973; Spongberg, 1972), familial recognition (sensu Krach, 1976) at this time seems premature. Perhaps segregation at the tribal or subtribal level is more appropriate. On the other hand, the distinctness of Darmera from other Saxifragaceae (e.g., Darmera differs from all other saxifrages in its embryo development and unitegmic testa) precludes submerging the genus in Saxifraga, a return to the original Englerian (1872) concept (see footnote 2). As noted by Takhtajan (1959, 1973), Darmera is certainly worthy of further detailed investigation.

Consequently, *Darmera* Voss (1899) has been overlooked by subsequent botanists (including *Index Kewensis*), the name appearing only in a 1903 publication by Voss, but not in his later books; in Post and Kuntze (1903), to which Voss had contributed; in Pilger (1906–08); Engler (1930); Lemée (1930); and in *Index Nominum Genericorum*. Curiously, the last 4 sources all relegate *Darmera* Voss to the synonymy of *Peltiphyllum* (Engler) Engler (1891) despite the fact that the latter is doubly bastardly in view of the prior legitimate *Peltophyllum* Gardner (1843) and the prior illegitimate *Peltophyllum* Massalongo (1854). None of the preceding sources, incidentally, correctly cite the original and valid publication of *Darmera* and *Darmera peltata*, namely, Voss (1899).

The lamentable conclusion is that two admirably appropriate descriptive names, *Peltiphyllum* (Engler) Engler and *Hexuris* Miers, are illegitimate. It is ironic that the legitimate but descriptively inappropriate *Peltophyllum* Gardner must be used for plants bearing only minute scale leaves. It is also regrettable that *Peltiphyllum peltatum* (Torrey) Engler, a familiar and striking Californian/Oregonian plant that is often cultivated, must yield its generic name to insignificant South American saprophytes and assume the obscure name *Darmera* Voss. The only alternative to these required changes is to conserve *Peltiphyllum* (Engler) Engler against *Peltophyllum* Gardner.

SUMMARY

(1) Triuridaceae:

Peltophyllum Gardner, Proc. Linn. Soc. 1:176 (1843), Trans. Linn. Soc. 19:157, pl. 15 (1845), non Massalongo (1854), non Engler (1891). Type: *Peltophyllum luteum* Gardner.

Hexuris Miers, Proc. Linn. Soc. 2:72 (1850), Trans. Linn. Soc. 21:44 (1852), nom. superfl., illeg.

(a) Peltophyllum luteum Gardner, op. cit. (1843, 1845). Hexuris gardneri Miers, op. cit. (1850, 1852), nom. superfl. illeg.

Triuris lutea (Gardner) Bentham & J. D. Hooker, Gen. Pl. 3:1002 (1883).

(b) Peltophyllum caudatum (Poulsen) Schmid & Turner, comb. nov.

Sciaphila caudata Poulsen, Vidensk. Meddel. Naturhist. Foren. Kjøbenhavn 36–38:165 (1886).

Hexuris caudata (Poulsen) Giesen, Pflanzenreich Heft 104:75 (1938).

(2) Saxifragaceae:

DARMERA A. Voss, Gärt. Zentral-Bl. 1:645 (1899).

Saxifraga L. sect. Peltiphyllum Engler, Monograph. Gatt. Saxifraga, 108 (1872). Type: Saxifraga peltata Torrey in Bentham. Peltiphyllum (Engler) Engler in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pfl. 3 (2a): 61 (1891), Nachtrag 3:141 (1906), Nachtrag 4:109 (1914), nom. illeg., later homonym of Peltophyllum Gardner (1843). DARMERA PELTATA (Torrey in Bentham) Voss, op. cit. 646 (1899).

Saxifraga peltata Torrey in Bentham, Pl. Hartweg., 311 (1849).

Peltiphyllum peltatum (Torrey in Bentham) Engler, op. cit. (1891).

(3) ?Nymphaeaceae, fossil leaf and fruit:

Peltophyllum Massalongo, Monograf. Dombeyacee Foss., 22 (1854), Spec. Photo. Anim. Quor. Pl. Foss., 75, pl. 28 (1859a), nom. illeg., non Gardner (1843), non Engler (1891—"Peltiphyllum"). Type: Peltophyllum nelumbioides Massalongo.

Peltophyllum nelumbioides Massalongo, op. cit. (1854, 1859a).

A check of the Compendium Index of Paleobotany (see Schmid and Schmid, 1973) and of the paleobotanical literature revealed acceptance of Massalongo's illegitimate genus only by Schimper (1874: 603), Meschinelli and Squinabol (1893: 326), and, of course, Massalongo himself (1854, 1858, 1859a, b). Other than the listing of the genus by Andrews (1970) in his index of generic names, there has been no recent discussion or acceptance of Peltophyllum Massalongo. The taxonomic affinities of Massalongo's fossil leaves from the Eocene of northeastern Italy are not known. Massalongo's assignment of the fossils to Nymphaeaceae ("Cabombee" or "Cabombeae"— Massalongo, 1858, 1859a, b, but initially to Dombeyaceae in Massalongo, 1854) was based on strictly superficial resemblances (Schmid and Schmid, 1973, 1974), as was typical of paleobotanical work of this era. After examining the original photograph in Massalongo (1859a), Hickey had "serious doubts that the type is really nymphaeaceous" (pers. comm., 1976). In view of the above, we are not perpetuating Peltophyllum Massalongo with a substitute generic name.

Acknowledgments

We thank T. O. Duncan, J. E. Eckenwalder, L. R. Heckard, M. Mouse, R. B. Phillips, A. R. Smith, E. G. Voss, and specially D. E. Johnson, P. C. Silva, and J. L. Strother for helpful comments and nomenclature advice, and also Dr. Paul Hiepko (Berlin) for supplying the photocopy of Voss's 1899 paper.

LITERATURE CITED

- Andrews, H. N., Jr. 1970. Index of generic names of fossil plants, 1820-1965. U.S. Geol. Surv. Bull. 1300.
- Bensel, C. R., and B. F. Palser. 1975a. Floral anatomy in the Saxifragaceae sensu lato. II. Saxifragoideae and Iteoideae. Amer. J. Bot. 62:661-675.
- _______, and _______. 1975b. *Idem*. IV. Baueroideae and conclusions. Amer. J. Bot. 62:688-694.
- CLOKIE, H. N. 1964. An account of the herbaria of the Department of Botany in the University of Oxford. Oxford: University Press.
- ENGLER, A. 1872. Monographie der Gattung Saxifraga L. mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der geographischen Verhältnisse. Breslau: J. U. Kern's Verlag (Max Müller).
- ———. 1891. Saxifragaceae. *In A.* Engler and K. Prantl [eds.], Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien 3,2a:41–93. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann. [Pp. 41–48, 1890, 49–93, 1891.] [Also Nachträge 1:180–182, 348 (1897), 2:29 (1900), 3:141–142 (1906), 226 (1907), 4:108–111 (1914).]
- ———. 1930. Saxifragaceae. *In A. Engler and K. Prantl's Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien.* 2. Aufl. by A. Engler [ed.]. 18a:74-226 [ed. by H. Harms]. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.
- GARDNER, G. 1843. Description of *Peltophyllum*, a new genus of plants allied to *Triuris* of Miers, with remarks on their affinities. Proc. Linnean Soc. London 1:176–177. [Reprinted *in* Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., I, 13:217. 1844].
- ------. 1845. Description of *Peltophyllum*, a new genus of plants allied to *Triuris* of Miers, with remarks on their affinities. Trans. Linnean Soc. London 19: 155–160.
- GIESEN, H. 1938. Triuridaceae. *In A.* Engler and L. Diels [eds.], Das Pflanzenreich IV/18(Heft 104):1–84. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann.
- Krach, J. E. 1976. Samenanatomie der Rosifloren I. Die Samen der Saxifragaceae. Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 97:1–60.
- Lemée, A. 1930. Dictionnaire descriptif et synonymique des genres de plantes phanérogames. T. 2. Brest: Imprimerie Commerciale et Administrative.
- MALME, G. O. A:N. 1896. Ueber *Triuris lutea* (Gardn.) Benth. et Hook. Bih. Kongl. Svenska Vetensk.-Akad. Handl., Afd. 3, 21(14):1–16.
- Massalongo, A. B. 1854. Monografia delle Dombeyacee fossili fino ad ora conosciute, Verona: G. Antonelli.
- ----. 1858. Palaeophyta rariora formationis tertiariae agri Veneti. Atti R. Ist. Veneto Sci., III, 3:729-793.
- ———. 1859a. Specimen photographicum animalium quorumdam plantarumque fossilium *Agri Veronensis*. Verona: Vicentini-Franchini.
- ——. 1859b. Syllabus plantarum fossilium hucusque in formationibus tertiariis agri Veneti detectarum. Verona: A. Merlo.
- MESCHINELLI, A., and X. SQUINABOL. 1893. Flora tertiaria Italica. Patavi: Sumptibus Auctorum Typis Seminarii.
- MIERS, J. 1841. Description of a new genus of plants from Brazil. Proc. Linnean Soc. London 1:96. [Reprinted *in* Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., I, 7:222. 1841.]
- ———. 1845. Description of a new genus of plants from Brazil. Trans. Linnean Soc. London 19:77–80.
- . 1850. On the family of *Triuriaceae*. Proc. Linnean Soc. London 2:71–77. [Reprinted in Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., II, 7:323–327. 1851.]
- _____. 1852. On the family of *Triuriaceae*. Trans. Linnean Soc. London 21:43-59.
- Pilger, R. [ed.]. 1906–08. Nachträge III to A. Engler and K. Prantl [eds.], Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann. [P. 141 on Darmera issued 1906.]

- Post, T. von, and O. Kuntze. 1903. Lexicon generum phanerogamarum. . . . Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. [Issued 1903, but dated 1904—teste F. A. Stafleu, 1967, Taxonomic Literature, p. 364.]
- Saxena, N. P. 1973. Studies in the family Saxifragaceae. IX. Anatomy of the flower of some members of Saxifraginae. J. Indian Bot. Soc. 52: 251-266.
- Schimper, W. P. 1874. Traité de paléontologie végétale . . . T. 3. Paris: J. B. Baillière et Fils.
- Schmid, R., and M. J. Schmid. 1973. Fossils attributed to the Orchidaceae. Amer. Orchid Soc. Bull. 42:17-27.
- ——, and ——. 1974. On Massalongo's fossils: *Protorchis* and *Palaeorchis*. Amer. Orchid Soc. Bull. 43:213–216.
- Schumann, C. 1894. Triuridaceae. *In C. F. P. de Martius*, A. W. Eichler and I. Urban [eds.], Flora Brasiliensis 3(3):645–668. Lipsiae: Frid. Fleischer in Comm. [Entire volume issued 1890–94.].
- Spongberg, S. A. 1972. The genera of Saxifragaceae in the southeastern United States. J. Arnold Arb. 53:409–498.
- Такнтајан, А. 1959. Die Evolution der Angiospermen. Jena: Gustav Fischer Verlag.
 ———. 1973. Evolution und Ausbreitung der Blütenpflanzen. Ed. R. Fritsch, A. Müller, and H. Ohle. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag.
- Voss, A. 1899. Darmera Voss. Gärt. Zentral-Bl. 1:645-646.
- ——. 1903. Salomon's Wörterbuch der deutschen Pflanzennamen 2. Aufl. Stuttgart: Verlagsbuchhandlung Eugen Ulmer.
- WAGNER, R. 1907. Zur Morphologie des *Peltiphyllum Peltatum* (Torr.) Engl. Sitzungsber. Kaiserl. Akad. Wiss., Math.-Naturwiss. Kl., Abt. 1, 116:1089–1107.

FROST SENSITIVITY AND RESPROUTING BEHAVIOR OF ANALOGOUS SHRUBS OF CALIFORNIA AND CHILE

HAROLD A. MOONEY Department of Biological Sciences Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

Detailed comparisons of the structure and function of sclerophyll vegetations centered in the matched climatic regions of central Chile and coastal California have shown a large degree of similarity in spite of divergent evolutionary histories of the floras of these 2 areas (Mooney et al., 1970; Mooney et al., 1977; Parsons, 1976). Principal differences are related to features responsive to land-use treatment which has differed substantially between regions, particularly in the past century (Mooney et al., 1972; Aschmann and Bahre, 1977).

Additional functional differences between these vegetations, particularly in phenological patterns of the woody plants, have been ascribed in part to the small climatic dissimilarities that exist between regions (Mooney et al., 1977). The broad aspects of the climate of the 2 regions are, however, quite similar. Monthly rainfall, drought duration, and mean temperatures can be matched station for station in coastal California and Chile (di Castri, 1973). Furthermore, the direction and magnitude of climatic changes that have occurred from the Pleistocene to the present have been quite comparable (Miller et al., 1977).